Symbolic improvisation; the coherence of language

Benjamin James

November 26, 2025

Language has always carried a tension between stability and change. Philosophers have treated words as if the primary task of language were the preservation or transmission of meaning, as though words were containers whose job was to hold an already-formed content and deliver it without leakage. Even when the philosophical tradition critiques representationalism, it tends to retain the assumption that language aims at semantic articulation. However, if we take seriously the idea that information matters only insofar as it contributes to the coherence of a system, Coherence Information Theory's (CIT) foundational claim, then language itself must be reconsidered. Words are not primarily vessels of meaning; they are vectors of structural alignment. Their purpose is not to report a state of affairs or encode propositions. Their purpose is to track, in real time, the underlying coherence gradients that govern the evolution of thought, perception, and collective sense-making. To speak improvisationally is to allow language to function as a dynamic interface to structure rather than a static scaffold of meanings.

To understand this shift, one must begin with CIT's core idea. Information does not possess value by virtue of its unpredictability, as Shannon argued, but by its contribution to systemic coherence. Entropy reduction alone is insufficient. A message may reduce uncertainty while introducing contradictions or instabilities into the receiving system. CIT reframes information as coherence-weighted material, where each symbol is assessed not by its statistical rarity but by its capacity to reinforce or degrade the system's structural persistence. What appears at first as a technical refinement of information theory quietly expands into a principle that cuts across epistemology, language, cognition, and cultural evolution. If information is coherence-bearing structure, then language, one of the most elaborate information systems humans have produced, must be judged not by how accurately it denotes or connotes, but by how effectively it maintains alignment between symbolic expression and underlying structural dynamics.

This raises a question that philosophy rarely asks. *What do words actually do to a system's coherence?* Formal semantics assumes they represent things; ordinary language philosophy assumes they participate in practices; hermeneutics assumes they open interpretive horizons. None of these models accounts for the possibility that the primary function of language is not to represent, participate, or disclose, but to navigate. If coherence gradients are the real forces shaping adaptive systems, then linguistic expression must be understood as a practice of orienting oneself along those gradients. A coherence gradient, in plain terms, is the direction in which a system gains stability. It is the path toward internal consistency, reduced contradiction, lower entropy leakage, expanded option space, and persistent intelligibility. It is not a physical gradient, though physical systems display analogous tendencies. It is not a mental gradient, though cognition rides it constantly. It is not an exclusively linguistic gradient, though language can gesture toward it. It is the structural "pull" exerted by the system as it moves toward states that are more capable of maintaining themselves under perturbation.

Philosophers will recognize the analogy. In metaphysics, it resembles Aristotle's notion of form as the internal principle of organization; in phenomenology, it resembles the self-organizing tendency of meaning to cohere into Gestalten; in pragmatism, it resembles the convergence of successful habits; in analytic philosophy, it parallels the drive toward reflective equilibrium. None of these analogies is exact, but they help triangulate the concept. *A coherence gradient is the system's tendency to become more itself*. Not in the essentialist sense, but in the structural sense. The system seeks configurations that preserve the integrity of its relational architecture. When speaking improvisationally, one is not arranging words according to semantic rules. One is feeling for the gradient and letting linguistic choices be guided by the immediate feedback it provides.

Improvisation, then, is not an aesthetic exercise. It is a structural necessity in environments where underlying realities shift more rapidly than language can stabilize. Philosophers have long observed that conceptual schemes ossify. Once a term gains currency, it begins to shape not only what is said but what can be said, constraining the interpretive field. This becomes a problem when the symbol lags behind the structure it was intended to indicate.

A stable term might once have gestured accurately at a situation, but if the situation evolves and the term remains rigid, the term becomes a source of misalignment. The system moves; the symbol stays; contradiction accumulates. Symbolic lock-in begins. At this point, discourse becomes less a means of understanding and more a rehearsal of outdated forms. Improvisation is the corrective, not because it invents new meanings, but because it refuses to let the linguistic surface harden prematurely.

To improvise symbolically is to use words as provisional indicators rather than permanent fixtures. Each symbol is a hypothesis about where the coherence gradient lies. A sentence is a trajectory traced through coherence space, its success measured not by its propositional truth or its analytic precision but by the extent to which it maintains alignment with the gradient it is trying to follow. This does not undermine truth; it reframes it. *Truth is the emergent property of coherence maintained across recursive interpretive layers, not a static correspondence between word and world*. Improvisation is the process by which language continually adjusts itself to preserve this alignment.

CIT provides the theoretical basis for this view. If signals have value only when they reinforce structural coherence, then linguistic signals must be evaluated on the same criterion. Words are coherence vectors, tools for nudging the cognitive or cultural system into states of lower contradiction and higher stability. They are not ends in themselves. Meaning is not what they contain but what they help maintain. The improviser does not search for the right word in the semantic sense; the improviser selects the word whose orientation best matches the local shape of the coherence gradient. The word appears, not because it satisfies a dictionary definition, but because it minimizes immediate structural tension. The next word is chosen under the same constraint. In this way, the discourse unfolds as a continuous navigation rather than a predetermined argument.

One may object that this collapses into relativism or fluency without content, but this objection arises only if one assumes that the underlying structure is itself arbitrary. Coherence gradients are not subjective preferences or stylistic whims; they are objective features of systems that must persist under entropy. A proposition either aligns with its own underlying commitments, or it collapses into contradiction. An argument either maintains

internal consistency, or it disintegrates. A concept either retains contact with the conditions that made it useful or becomes inert. Improvisation is not the abandonment of rigor; it is the abandonment of rigidity. It is a discipline of maintenance, not a celebration of arbitrariness. The improviser is constrained, but the constraint is dynamic. The obligation is to remain in contact with the shifting structure rather than with frozen symbols.

The implications for philosophy of language are considerable. If words are not primarily semantic units but coherence-testing probes, then much of the traditional search for meaning, from analytic definitions to conceptual analysis and disambiguation practices, rests on a mistaken understanding of what language is doing. The drive for clarity, as ordinarily understood, often attempts to freeze the symbol so that its meaning can be inspected. But clarity, in a coherence-first frame, is not the elimination of ambiguity; it is the elimination of internal contradiction. A term may be ambiguous but coherent if its ambiguity maps onto a real ambiguity in the underlying structure. A term may be precise but incoherent if its precision forces the system into an artificially narrow configuration. Improvisation allows the system to maintain flexibility without sacrificing rigor because rigor comes from alignment, not from fixated symbols.

This mode of thinking also clarifies why so much philosophical progress occurs not by refining definitions but by shifting metaphors, rearticulating intuitions, or inventing new conceptual scaffolds. These are improvisational acts in the CIT sense; they adjust the coherence vectors that guide interpretive practice. When a philosopher introduces a new metaphor, it is not a stylistic choice but a reorientation toward a different region of coherence space. The metaphor is discarded once the gradient has been clarified. Improvisation is not a threat to philosophical discourse; it is what allows philosophical discourse to remain open to the complexity of the phenomena it addresses.

One might ask whether there is any content left if symbols are so transient. However, transience does not imply emptiness. It implies that content is not stored in the symbol but in the structure that the symbol helps reveal. In this view, language is a tool for navigating complexity. The structure being navigated, whether metaphysical, epistemic, ethical, or phenomenological, remains stable enough to guide the improvisational process. The

improviser is not creating reality; the improviser is tracking it. The symbol dissolves, but the structure remains, and each dissolution allows the next symbol to be selected with greater fidelity.

What distinguishes symbolic improvisation from ordinary speech is the explicit commitment to treat language as a dynamic instrument rather than a static code. Ordinary speech often aims to preserve linguistic norms, reactivating familiar forms that have lost contact with the realities they were designed to describe. Improvisational speech releases the symbol as soon as its coherence contribution weakens. Its discipline lies in constant evaluation. *Does this linguistic move reduce or increase internal contradiction? Does it open or collapse option space? Does it maintain structural alignment or drift into entropy?* Only symbols that satisfy these criteria survive long enough to be extended. Everything else evaporates.

When framed as the linguistic extension of Coherence Information Theory, symbolic improvisation appears not as a stylistic innovation but as an inevitable consequence of a coherence-first epistemology. If information is structural reinforcement, then language must serve the same function. The goal of discourse is no longer to state truths in the propositional sense but to maintain the conditions under which truths can be meaningfully stabilized. This is a shift from language as representation to language as regulation. It does not diminish the intellectual content of discourse; it acknowledges that content cannot be separated from the structural conditions that make it intelligible.

Those attuned to the history of metaphysics and epistemology will recognize that this approach circumvents the traditional oscillation between realism and anti-realism. Improvisation assumes neither that language maps perfectly onto an external reality nor that language merely constructs a reality of its own. Instead, language becomes the adaptive interface between structure and interpretation. The external world exerts constraints; the internal cognitive system tries to maintain alignment; language mediates the alignment process. In this sense, symbolic improvisation is neither constructivist nor representational; it is relational. It is the practice of maintaining a viable relation between thought and structure in an environment where both evolve.

The same audience will recognize echoes of other philosophical frameworks, Wittgenstein's language games, Heidegger's clearing, or Peirce's semiotic triads, but symbolic improvisation differs in one crucial respect. It provides a dynamic criterion for linguistic adequacy that does not rely on social agreement, phenomenological disclosure, or inferential roles. The criterion is structural coherence. A linguistic move is valid if it increases stability in the overall system. This criterion is neither subjective nor intersubjective; it is systemic. It applies across cognitive, cultural, scientific, and conceptual layers. The improviser does not consult consensus or intuition but the coherence gradient itself.

Ultimately, symbolic improvisation allows language to adapt without sacrificing precision. It rejects the idea that precision requires static definitions, and it rejects the idea that rigor requires semantic rigidity. It replaces them with a demand for structural fidelity: the capacity to let symbols shift as the system reveals new regions of coherence. In this sense, symbolic improvisation is not merely the linguistic extension of Coherence Information Theory; it is the linguistic form of any inquiry that takes coherence, rather than representation, as its fundamental constraint. Words matter only to the extent that they help reveal the structure that persists beyond them. When they no longer do so, they must be abandoned. Language survives by dissolving, and meaning survives by moving.

References

James, B. (2025). Beyond Shannon: Coherence Information Theory and the Future of Communication. PhilPapers. https://philpapers.org/rec/JAMBSC

James, B. (2025). Formal Foundations of Coherence Information Theory: Capacity and Compression Theorems. PhilPapers. https://philpapers.org/rec/JAMFFO-2

James, B. (2025). Reality's Experiment: Neurotypical Lock-in, Neurodivergent Disruption. Kindle Direct. Audible. https://philpapers.org/rec/JAMREN